

**Grand Bargain in 2018:**  
**Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary**

**Name of Institution:**

[International Committee of the Red Cross](#)

**Point of Contact (name, title, email):**

[Elena Garagorri-Atristain.](#)

[Senior Advisor on Policy. Resource Mobilisation Division.](#)

[egaragorri@icrc.org](mailto:egaragorri@icrc.org)

**Date of Submission:**

[23 March 2019](#)

**Question 1: Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2018.**

**Participation Revolution / Accountability to Affected People (AAP): Working more closely with affected communities in an organic manner.**

- In order to more clearly assess the current situation and identify priority areas, the ICRC commissioned an [external evaluation of Diversity, Inclusion, and AAP in ICRC operations](#). Based on an extensive document review, interviews and five field trips, the evaluation was completed in August 2018. The evaluation's findings and recommendations were used to finalize the [AAP framework](#), and to inform the AAP team's plans and assess resources needed for 2019.
- In the second half of 2018, 13 ICRC delegations completed an **AAP self-assessment**. Building on the feedback received from these delegations and following the finalisation of the AAP framework, the self-assessment survey was reviewed and in 2019, new internal digital tools (e.g. Tableau software) will be used to generate richer and more detailed insights.
- The **community-based protection approach** was identified by the AAP evaluation as a practice to promote internally. Between 2015 and 2018, 38 workshops took place in 20 delegations, involving nearly 1,200 participants from communities affected by armed conflict or other situations of violence.
- Our partnership with [Ground Truth Solutions](#) in **Afghanistan** and **the Philippines** continued with community-satisfaction surveys and staff training on survey design, roll-out and implementation for future rounds. Based on these two experiences, the ICRC developed a concept note and hired Ground Truth to develop a perception-survey toolkit in order to allow delegations to organize such surveys more independently and professionally.
- The use of **hotlines** continued and was improved through a project to include a new software that allows for more effective follow up of feedback and inquiries. The project finished its build phase towards the end of 2018, with four delegations due to adopt the system in the first semester of 2019.

**Harmonized Reporting: Planning and monitoring tools enhanced, but efficiency gains remain elusive.**

- In 2018, the roll-out of the new tools for the annual planning and monitoring process continued with the implementation of a new monitor for results process across all delegations. The monitoring tool has enabled more results-focused reporting, as shown in the ICRC's 2018 Midterm Report. Building on the field model, the new planning process and tool was also rolled out at headquarters in 2018.
- Efforts to align internal and external reporting requirements intensified as foreseen, although it has remained challenging in light of the ever-evolving donor requirements. While the ICRC has harmonized and automated some internal reporting processes, challenges remain and the evolving external environment is making it harder to ensure that desired efficiency gains can come to fruition.

**Enhanced Quality Funding: Tension between flexible and predictable funding?**

**Amount of multi-year funding as per contracts signed.**

	2017 Amount (in CHF million)	2017 Percentage	2018 Amount (in CHF million)	2018 Percentage
Non-earmarked	464.6	68,3%	39.9	15.5%
Regionally earmarked	1.1	0.2%	-	-
Country Earmarked	207.5	30.5%	189.5	73.7%
Tightly earmarked	6.9	1.0%	27.8	10.8%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>680.1</b>		<b>143.8</b>	

**Amount of multi-year funding available for implementation.**

	2017 Amount (in CHF million)	2017 Percentage	2018 Amount (in CHF million)	2018 Percentage
<b>Non-earmarked</b>	146.2	50.8%	131.7	34%
<b>Regionally earmarked</b>	0.3	0.1%	0.5	0.1%
<b>Country Earmarked</b>	137.8	47.9%	231.8	59.8%
<b>Tightly earmarked</b>	3.4	1.2%	23.6	6%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>287.1</b>		<b>387.6</b>	

Looking at the tables above, one can draw two main conclusions:

- While ICRC has more multi-year funds available for operations in 2018 in comparison with 2017, new contracts in 2018 have – rather drastically – reduced multi-year contributions.
- The amounts of multi-year contributions available to the organization in 2018 were less flexible. This pattern is shown both in the contracts signed in 2018, as well as in the funds available for implementation.

#### **Earmarking/Flexibility of overall funding.**

	2016	2017	2018
<b>Non-earmarked</b>	22.59%	21.71%	22.0%
<b>Loosely earmarked</b>	7.29%	6.41%	7.8%
<b>Country earmarked</b>	54.75%	56.66%	56.3%
<b>Tightly earmarked</b>	15.37%	15.22%	13.8%

- Following the feedback received from donors through the Grand Bargain discussions as to what was needed for them to loosen the earmarking of their contributions, we shared an update arguing the case for non-earmarked funding to the ICRC Donor Support Group<sup>1</sup> in July 2018, which developed those same points. Also, in order to increase the visibility of “good donorship”, data was shared on the “ranking” of donors as per absolute and relative figures.
- In 2018, the ICRC has seen an increase of flexible contributions, in both absolute and relative figures. It remains to be seen in the coming years if this is the reversal of a trend.

#### **Launch of the National Society Investment Alliance (NSIA) with the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent.**

- The ICRC worked with the IFRC to set up a funding mechanism specifically dedicated to fund capacity-building projects of National Societies.
- National Society applications opened in October 2018, and selected ones will receive allocations in 2019.

#### **Question 2: Please explain how the outcomes/results will lead to long-term institutional changes in policy and/or practice.**

- In line with its institutional strategy, the ICRC will continue to increase its proximity with the affected communities, working to maintain or increase its access to and acceptance in contexts affected by armed conflict or other situations of violence.
- This proximity and adaptability are paramount to address the humanitarian needs of affected communities and to have thorough insights to assess and determine the main concerns to tackle through our programmes. This will very much link with the commitments in workstream 6, as mentioned above. It is also related to developing the commitments of workstreams 2 and 3, to name but the most salient ones in relation to programming. We will also continue to roll-out tools to give our teams in the field the possibility to combine emergency work with a medium- to long-term approach in our programmes so as to be able to tackle early onset crises, while also partnering with the communities in order to jointly develop their resilience. This is linked to the prevalence of protracted armed conflicts and, increasingly, to the multiplier effect that climate change can have in the humanitarian needs of affected communities.

<sup>1</sup> The ICRC Donor Support Group is made up of governments, supranational organizations and international institutions that contribute a minimum of CHF 10 million in cash annually.

- This will be coupled with decisive efforts to improve our reporting, both internal and external.
- Without a significant increase in the quality of our funding, we expect the tension caused by increased donor requirements to be one of the main risks faced by the organization.

**Question 3: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women’s empowerment<sup>2</sup> in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard**

- **Global Public Policy Institute (GPPI) evaluation of Diversity, Inclusion and AAP in ICRC operations:**  
The evaluation’s findings helped finalize the ICRC’s AAP framework, but were not sufficient for developing a policy or framework on gender or diversity. Therefore, a follow-up to the GPPI evaluation on diversity and inclusion in ICRC operations will be conducted in 2019.
  - The ICRC’s AAP framework included requirements such as: analyzing social dynamics as part of context analysis, and proactively identifying barriers some groups may face to access services.
- **Gender mainstreaming:** An assessment of gender mainstreaming in ICRC was conducted, which included gaps and recommendations on requirements for gender mainstreaming in ICRC.
  - Some of the main findings included: confusion about the meaning of gender; dismissive attitudes towards gender expertise; inadequate resources in terms of dedicated funding, protected time, and lack of gender experts (e.g. usually junior staff with minimal training were assigned “gender” in addition to their regular workload); and institutional push-back to gender as a relevant area.
  - Recommendations included: dedicated funding streams, transformative hiring practices, and greater financial and institutional support of individual actors making institutional change in the long term; bringing gender experts into the institutional hierarchy; developing a policy and practice of intersectionality to address gender binaries and to more explicitly include men and boys; support community-based approach as a way of engaging in analyses of power both locally and internationally; and investing in external experts, academics and practitioners, to ensure timely and updated knowledge of subject areas of concern to the ICRC.
- **Gendering ICRC workshop:** A workshop on “Gendering ICRC” was held in New York, in November 2018. The purpose of the workshop was to bring researchers and practitioners together to learn from each other and identify avenues for collaboration and advancing on gender mainstreaming in ICRC.

**Question 4: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments?**

In 2018, the ICRC and development organizations continued to ensure future endeavours are streamlined and reap the added value of the collaboration that lies in preserving the uniqueness of each organization’s mandate and working procedures.

- Initial collaboration underscored the significant potentials of joint efforts. The differing mandates and working procedures require further fine-tuning to safeguard essential values of humanitarian actors and key rules of financial institutions. Of note, a collaborative project with the World Bank in the health domain was launched at the end of 2018. Discussions were held with the African Development Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, while collaboration with the Agence Française Développement continued encouragingly as well.
- Transaction costs remain very high. Requirements will likely lead in the medium to long term to heavier overhead costs., calling for systemic and procedural consideration needing to be reflected at the structural and procedural levels.
- ‘Operationalizing the nexus’ is but in its initial phases and will likely deliver in the medium term. Risk-averse financial institutions need to be cognizant of fluid and unpredictable environment of conflict-affected contexts and be ready to shoulder some of the ensuing risk. Principled humanitarian action also needs to be preserved from the transformational agendas of international financial institutions and the politicization of aid of national development ones, in order to safeguard the spirit and aim of humanitarian aid.

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available [here](#).